



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/782,896	02/13/2001	Dan Kikinis	007287.00045	3324
22907 7590 07/23/2012 BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD. 1100 13th STREET, N.W. SUITE 1200 WASHINGTON, DC 20005-4051				
EXAMINER				
RAMAN, USHA				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2424				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/23/2012		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte DAN KIKINIS

Appeal 2010-005257
Application 09/782,896
Technology Center 2400

Before LANCE LEONARD BARRY, ST. JOHN COURTENAY III and
THU A. DANG, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

BARRY, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The Patent Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-14, and 16-22. The Appellant appeals therefrom under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a). We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

INVENTION

The following claim illustrates the invention on appeal:

19. A set-top box for generating 3-D enhanced advertising from 2-D video broadcasts, comprising:

a processor; and

a storage device, wherein the storage device is configured to store a library of 3-D objects;

wherein the processor is configured to:

receive the 2-D broadcast including a first advertisement having a 2-D image;

identify the 2-D image within the advertisement, wherein said 2-D image is identified based on its characteristics and exclusively at a viewer's equipment;

look-up a 3-D object matching the 2-D image in the library; and

use the matching 3-D object to generate an enhanced first advertisement, wherein the enhanced first advertisement has a 3-D highlighted rendering of the image produced by pushing the 3-D object into the original 2-D image, and further wherein said 3-D highlighted rendering of the image comprises a portion of the original 2-D image and said 3-D object.

REJECTION

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-14, and 16-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent (Application Pub.) No.: 2005/0166224 A1 ("Ficco") and U.S. Patent No. 6,556,196 B1 ("Blanz").

DISCUSSION

Based on the dependencies of the claims, we will decide the appeal of claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-14, and 16-22 on the basis of independent claims 1, 7, 13, and 19.

The issue before us follows. Did the Examiner err in finding that Blanz teaches looking up a 3-D object that matches an inputted 2-D image, as required by independent claims 1, 7, 13, and 19?

The Examiner admits that "Ficco does not expressly state that the enhancement object comprise 3-D objects." (Ans. 4.) The Examiner finds that "Blanz discloses that a database comprising 3D objects (e.g. human faces, col. 12, lines 19-21) from which a 3D object is supplied to the object analyzer. This additionally reads on 'looking up a matching 3-D object in a[n] image library, wherein the library comprises one or more 3-D objects'." (Ans. 7.)

The question of obviousness is "based on underlying factual determinations including . . . what th[e] prior art teaches explicitly and inherently." *In re Zurko*, 258 F.3d 1379, 1383 (Fed. Cir. 2001) (citations omitted).

Here, we agree with the Appellant's following argument.

[T]he cited passages of Blanz do not teach or suggest looking-up a **matching** 3-D object. In fact, Blanz specifically describes the retrieval of an **average** face to an object analyzer. Col. 12,

ll. 24-28. Blanz states that the object analyzer then generates a 3-D model of an input image by modifying the retrieved average face model. Col. 12, ll. 33-36; *see also* Col. 8, ll. 4-11. Thus, as clearly stated by Blanz, the 3-D model that allegedly matches the 2-D input image is generated by the object analyzer, not retrieved or looked-up from a library. Stated differently, the retrieval from the 3-D object database in Blanz is merely of an ***average*** face, not one that matches the 2-D input image.

(Reply Br. 2.)

Therefore, we conclude that the Examiner erred in finding that Blanz teaches looking up a 3-D object that matches an inputted 2-D image, as required by independent claims 1, 7, 13, and 19.

DECISION

We reverse the rejection of claims 1, 7, 13, and 19 and of claims 2, 4-6, 8, 10-12, 14, 16-18, and 17-22, which depend therefrom.

REVERSED

Vsh